

ANOTHER TILT AT THE WINDMILL

The community must have been no less surprised than ourselves by the communication from the pen of the Honorable David McConaughy, which appeared in the Star & Sentinel of August 1st, a flagrant "illustration of the gross injustice" which the reckless use to which a great and good man may prostitute his high attainments, and if unrestrained inflict upon a community in the name of truth and justice.

"Like a mad man playing with fire, the honorable gentleman indulges in wanton charges, aspersions of motives, detraction of character," and absolute fairy stories, to believe himself of the charges preferred against him by the G.A.R., and with a degree of impudence that is sublime even in the Honorable David McConaughy, for which "he deserves to be pilloried in public contempt for his mendacity," he proceeds his professional duties. We were not aware that his clients were so numerous, but since his grandiloquent effusion, we have been informed that he has a set speech to that effect, which he never loses an opportunity to rehearse for the edification of the country people on court days. \*\*\*

Like his illustrious progenitor, Bombastes Furiose, the honorable gentleman has a fickle memory, and when he states that he knew nothing of what was transpiring at the Home, we hope he will pardon us if we fail to see ~~the truth of~~ his remark--not that we wish to insinuate that he is untruthful, but perhaps the public are not aware that the gentleman met with a mishap early in the season, which he denominated an "incipient sun-stroke," from which he seems to have not fully recovered.

We are informed by a respectable member of society, one whose word will be taken even in Gettysburg with as much confidence as the honorable gentleman's, that he was seen to go into the Homestead upon the evening of the day succeeding the day upon which a Guardian was appointed for Belle Hunter, and the evening upon which the girls were taken away as previously described.

As to the honorable gentleman's not having been consulted in reference to the treatment of Belle Hunter and comrade, is it reasonable to suppose that the honorable gentleman could be a frequent visitor at the Home after being the matron's legal adviser, and being informed as he states of the refractory character of the two girls, without being consulted as to the best mode of punishment? Here is the case: The honorable gentleman has been her legal adviser, and he is in the habit of

visiting the Home, as we can prove. The woman when told that she was violating the law replied, "I know just how far I can go without violating the statutes, for I have had legal advice upon the subject;" and then when asked if she had consulted the honorable gentleman, she refused to answer.

Now, sir, after your boasted practice of thirty-two years, would you not have made the same inquiry, and if the woman refused to answer, would you not have interpreted that refusal into an acknowledgement that you had named the man? Under the circumstances who has done you the injustice (which we do not admit) the G.A.R., or that woman? \*\*\*\*\*

The honorable gentleman states that he had no desire to mingle in this controversy. That being the case why did he rush into it? No one, unless it was the pious doctor for whom he has so much respect, requested him to write that unfortunate letter, which he states was for Dr. Bourns and not for the public. Had Dr. Bourns kept faith with him, the G.A.R. would never have seen the letter, (if he is entitled to belief) but it appeared first in the Record, and then in the Compiler. It contained what we know to be an infamous falsehood, and thus we were drawn into a reply upon which we purpose to stand. \*\*\*\*

The honorable gentleman rushes valiantly to the rescue of his famous pair, and states that but for Dr. Bourns the Home would never have done its noble work. That may be true, but how about that seven thousand dollars mortgage for services rendered by Dr. Bourns? How about the matron's statement that he was living off the Home and throwing all the responsibilities upon her shoulders? And how about the matron's little claim for services? It is quite evident that charity has been the exciting motive to all this good that has been done, but does it not also look as though a portion of their charity had begun with the doctor and the matron, and in their benevolence they seem to have included the honorable gentleman to the extent of six tons of coal. \*\*\*\*\*

The honorable gentleman denies having characterized the G.A.R. an illiterate mob. "Another proof that the gentleman has not recovered from that insipient sun-stroke," but the fact is, he so denounced us in open court, in the presence of the officers of the court and a large number of spectators drawn there to hear his eloquent argument in defense of that woman who was being "avowedly prosecuted by a combination of men." The attack was outside of the evidence, malicious and false. Too cowardly to make it to a member of the order upon the street, he abuses his

privilege as an attorney under the protection of the court, and now that his chickens are come home to roost, he is mean enough to deny it. As to intimidating you, you flatter yourself, \*\*\*\*\*

By order of \_\_\_\_\_ skelly  
Corporal Shelly Post  
No. 9, G.A.R.

Star-Sentinel  
AUG. 1877

\*\*\*\*\*

#### TO THE PUBLIC

To the very remarkable effusion in answer to my defense there is time and occasion but for a brief reply. Its bitterness is foreign to all candor and fairness. Having relation to a charity it is full of uncharitableness. The scandal-monger is universally odious, and when he adds to this, natural scurrility he is a public loathing. His very venom and vituperation defeat his end. Although scarce a year in a community he gathers into his insatiable maw all the stale slanders of many years, of which the chief ingredient is falsehood. If he rushes into print, common decency requires that his effusions be expurgated. Not unlikely he soon has his hands full of actions of slander. Yet his character is soon known, and a discerning public accepts his statements at what they are really worth--nothing--and they thus may cease to work out their mission of slander.

I certainly will not stoop to enter into competition with this written in his own peculiar province of vile abuse and billingsgate. For that he has now an unenviable distinction.

This a model reformer of charitable Institutions? His proper sphere is the fish market. Like one who had made the rash resolve not to yield the way to any living thing, but afterwards met on a narrow path a harmless but not odorless animal, and waived his resolution, I cheerfully step aside and give this one a wide berth.

But to the community in which I have lived all my life, I have a few words to add. This writer in his first article charged that I was

the adviser of the alleged punishment or treatment of the two girls, adding other imputations, designed to affect me injuriously with the public. To this charge that I was such an adviser, or even had any knowledge of the alleged treatment I made the broad and positive denial, which I now again make. Its utter untruth being within my own knowledge I made it indignantly--and that denial I am ready and free at all times to maintain, and before any impartial tribunal. Nor is it true that I called at the Homestead in June before the removal of the girls, nor that I had any knowledge of the occurrence until their actual removal--nor even any knowledge of their removal until after I wrote the letter of June 7th. Had I known it then I would not have written the letter. Even this last effusion of the writer furnishes evidence that the charge of being adviser was made without knowledge--and at most from conjecture or inference which proves baseless.

Notwithstanding this writer's reiteration, those who were present at the trial referred to will sustain me in the fact that I did not use the epithet "illiterate mob" in reference to the Grand Army of the Republic, nor at all in my address. I confidentially leave this question of fact to the court, the Bar, the Jury, and the public then present.

Whilst claiming the right of private judgment in common with other citizens, and differing widely with the writer, I have dealt only with the subject matter as it was sought to be made to apply personally to myself--and leave that issue with the public. The writer has so far forgotten his role of Reformer of Charities as to indulge almost wholly in low vituperation. He has thereby abundantly shown that his virtues and spirit and demeanor are not such as to fit him for the mission which he has undertaken.

Respectfully  
D. McConaughy

Star & Sentinel  
August 15, 1877